

**- - REMARKS - -**

Claims 1, 10, and 19 have been amended without entering new matter. Support for these amendments is found, inter alia, in paragraphs 41, 42, and 43 of the specification.

The Applicants respond to each ground of rejection as subsequently recited herein, and respectfully request reconsideration and further examination of the present application under 37 CFR § 1.112:

**A. Claims 9, 18, and 27 were objected to**

The objection to claims 9, 18, and 27 has been obviated by correction of a typographical error. Claims 9, 18, and 27 have not been amended to avoid any reference. Withdrawal of the objection to claims 9, 18, and 27 is respectfully requested.

**B. Claims 10-18 were rejected as nonstatutory**

The §101 rejection of claims 10-18 is traversed. Contrary to the Examiner's assertion, each claim actually recites that the computer readable medium includes "computer readable code", and therefore claims 10-18 recite statutory material. Withdrawal of the §101 rejection is requested.

**C. Claims 1, 6-10, 15-19, and 24-27 were rejected as unpatentable over Tani in view of Hopper**

Claims 1, 6-10, 15-19, and 24-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,151,974 to Tani in view of a publication by Hopper. This rejection is traversed.

In order to make a *prima facie* case of obviousness under § 103(a), all of the claimed elements of the invention must be taught or suggested by the prior art (MPEP § 2143.03). Because the reference does not disclose each and every element, this rejection must fall.

At a minimum, Tani in view of Hopper fails to teach or suggest determining whether the direction of a presentation of the navigation frame is optimized to accommodate the changes to the information level within the display window and displaying the second display window subsequent to the initial display of the first display window in response to the user interacting with the first window-sizing interface and based on whether the direction of the presentation is optimized as claimed in claims 1, 10, and 19. At most, Tani in view of Hopper teach or suggest tabbed navigation of panes.

Claims 6-9, 15-18, and 24-27 depend directly or indirectly from one of claims 1, 10, or 19, and are therefore patentable for at least the same reasons.

Withdrawal of the rejections to claims 1, 6-10, 15-19, and 24-27 is requested.

- D.** Claims 2-5, 11-14, and 20-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Tani in view of Hopper in view of Henshaw

The rejection of claims 2-5, 11-14, and 20-23 is traversed.

Claims 2-5, 11-14, and 20-23 depend directly or indirectly from one of claims 1, 10, or 19, and are therefore patentable for at least the same reasons.

Withdrawal of the rejections to claims 2-5, 11-14, and 20-23 is requested.

**SUMMARY**

The rejections of the pending claims have been obviated by the above amendment and remarks. The Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-27 fully satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §§ 102, 103 and 112. In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, favorable consideration and early passage to issue of the present application are respectfully requested.

Dated: **September 18, 2007**

Respectfully submitted,  
RANDAL L. BERTRAM, *et al.*

CARDINAL LAW GROUP  
Suite 2000  
1603 Orrington Avenue  
Evanston, Illinois 60201  
Phone: (847) 905-7111  
Fax: (847) 905-7113

/FRANK C. NICHOLAS/

---

Frank C. Nicholas  
Registration No. 33,983  
Attorney for Applicants